



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

it was night, he would not return to look for the money until morning. The covetous peasants, thinking that he spoke truly, sneaked off one by one,—and thus Manchego had an opportunity of warming himself at leisure. (pp. 81–83.)

XI.

LA VIEJA LAS MOÇAS Y EL GALLO.

A good old woman was wont to call her maids at cock-crow. In order that they would not have to get up so early, they killed the cock; but, contrary to their expectations, the woman called them even earlier. (p. 76.)

SOURCE. Aesop, 79.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. *La Fontaine*, v. 6, ed. Regnier.

XII.

EL EMPERADOR Y SU HIJO.

The emperor of Trapisonda resolved to marry Florisena, daughter of the King of Natalio; she was under twenty, he over seventy. Arminto, his young son, was sent to fetch her. Florisena became enamoured of the prince. This love was reciprocated, but knowing the severity of his father the prince restrained himself, feigning withal not to understand her advances, and avoiding her presence as much as possible. She wrote to the emperor, complaining because he had sent one who was so rude toward her, and who declined to do her behests. The princess even hinted that the son's indifference might be indicative of the father's little love for her. The emperor bade the prince be more obedient to Florisena. On the way to the court, she continued her attempts to win Arminto. One night she feigned sickness, dismissed all her retinue save one servant, whom she bade call the prince. She then told him how she had learnt that one of her maids was seeking to betray her, by giving admission to a lover, disguised as a woman. She further told Arminto that if this occurred that night she would call him. The prince resolved to act as sentinel. Meanwhile Florisena went out, unnoticed, and returned at night. The prince saw a woman enter; but he waited until summoned. Then he entered her quarters. Florisena embraced him, and thereupon cried out that he had dishonored

her. While attempting to escape, the prince was caught by the guards. When brought before the emperor, Florisena confessed that she was to blame, not Arminto; she had forced the prince, averring that she mistook him for her husband. Her wiles were successful and she was given the prince to wife. (pp. 97–110.)

SOURCE. This story is akin to the type represented by the history of *Antiochus and Seleucus*⁶; but a closer parallel is not known to me.

XIII.

LA ENFERMA DE LOS OJOS Y EL MEDICO.

A widow had sore eyes and offered to pay a certain doctor a fixed sum if he cured her. The doctor took advantage of the continued absence of her only servant and at each visit stole something. When the widow was cured, he demanded his pay, but, as she could see less in her house than before, she assured him that she was under no obligations to pay him. (pp. 115–6.)

SOURCE. Aesop, 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kirchhof, I, 112; *Certainne Conceyts* . . . ed. Hazlitt, 1864, p. 7; *Mery Tales, Wittie Questions* . . . ed. Hazlitt, No. lxxxix.

(To be continued).

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Chicago.

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FIVE
PRINTS OF THE TESTINA AND THE
TERMINUS POST QUEM OF THE
ORIGINAL PRINT. I.

The edition of Machiavelli's works of 1550,¹ which from the head of the author on the main title and some or all of the sub-titles generally goes by the name of the Testina, is the first collective edition of all the writings of the author printed in the sixteenth century, i. e., 1) the

⁶ See also Landau, *Decam.*, § 12.

¹ Tutte le Opere | di Nicolo Machiavelli | Cittadino et
Secretario | Fiorentino | divise in V Parti | et di nuouo
con sonma accuratezza | ristampate | picture of the author |
M. D. L.

Historie Fiorentine, 2) the *Principe* and what goes with it, 3) the *Discorsi*, 4) the *Arte della Guerra*, and 5) the *Asino d'Oro* with the minor works of fiction including the *Mandragola* and *Clitia*. It obtained greater renown and enjoyed it longer than any other, for down to 1782 all following editions of these writings were based on it exclusively, the Accademia della Crusca made it the standard text of the author and its influence has not yet ceased to be felt.

Critics have been more actively engaged in trying to determine the place where the Testina was printed than in the other questions connected with it. To be sure Gamba in his *Serie dei Testi di Lingua*, etc., 4th ed., Venice, 1839, pp. 193-195, partly building on the investigations of predecessors, distinguished and described five different prints, but neither he nor any one after him made a serious attempt to fix their mutual relations. On the contrary, Gamba No. 1 came tacitly to be accepted as representing the Testina,² and only a few years ago Lisio in his critical edition of the *Principe*³ condemned the entire Testina on the strength of some twenty specified errors and arbitrary alterations found in No. 1, while almost two-thirds of these charges and the very gravest ones do not apply to the original print.

As for the place of the Testina it became pretty well established, both for typographical and other reasons, that some of the later prints were made in Geneva, and not in 1550 or thereabouts, but during the first part of the following century. No one, however, has expressed serious doubts concerning the correctness of 1550 as the date of the original print except Bonghi, who in an article in the *Archivio Storico Italiano* of 1897⁴ casually remarked that the five prints belonged to the first half of the seventeenth century. Yet as this assertion of his was not supported by any evi-

dence, it was simply passed over, and two years later Lisio spoke again of the Testina as having originally appeared in 1550.

Now a critical examination of the five prints of the Testina in connection with the preceding editions of the separate writings of Machiavelli yields the following results. The original print is not Gamba No. 1 but Gamba No. 5, which also by its general make up far surpasses the others. Of the remaining four only No. 2 derives directly from No. 5. No. 1 and No. 3 both rest on No. 2, while No. 4, as might have been expected, is a reprint of No. 3. The first print can actually not belong to 1550, but its *terminus post quem* is 1588. This is proved by the fact that it has made use of the edition of the *Arte della Guerra*, Palermo, 1587, and of that of the *Asino d'Oro*, etc., including the *Mandragola* and *Clitia*, Roma, 1588.

I. The Mutual Relations of the Five Prints.

The most striking difference between Gamba No. 5 on the one hand and Gamba Nos. 1-4 on the other is found in the seven 'Figure' or drawings and their explanations which accompany the *Arte della Guerra*. In No. 5 the 'Figure' follow after the text; in Nos. 1-4 they are inserted at the places to which they refer. In No. 5 the 'Figure' are immediately preceded both by the explanations which concern all and by those which relate to each in particular; in Nos. 1-4 the former are placed between preface and text, the latter attached to each separate 'Figura.' In No. 5 the various kinds of troops and officers are designated by o, ó, X, r, s (misprint for t), C, O, Φ, ω, S, Z, φ, Y; in Nos. 1-4 by o, n, X, V, u, C, T, D, A, S, Z, r, e. In No. 5 finally 'Figure' 1-6 are essentially different from the corresponding ones in Nos. 1-4, and 'Figura' 7, though similar, is more elaborate. Now No. 5 agrees in every point mentioned save the last with all the separate editions of the *Arte* of the sixteenth century,⁵ and in the last, i. e. in 'Figura'

² A note in a copy of No. 1 in the Library of the University of Leipzig says: *Celle ci est la vrai (!) édition originale du 1550—et la plus correcte, ainsi citée par les Académiciens de la Crusca.*

³ Il Principe di Niccolò Machiavelli. Testo Critico con Introduzione e Note a cura di Giuseppe Lisio, Firenze, Sansoni, 1899. For the Testina see here and later pp. xxxiii f.

⁴ Serie 5, vol. XIX, pp. 126-135: *Un aneddoto di bibliografia Machiavellesca*. The Testina is mentioned pp. 129 f.

⁵ These editions are: Florence, Giunti, 1521, 1529 and 1551. Venice, 1537, 1540 and 1552; Sons of Aldo, 1540 and 1546. Comin de Trino, 1541. Giolito, 1550. Giglio, 1554. Palermo, Anton(i)ello degli Anton(i)elli, 1587. I have examined all of them except Giunti, 1521 and 1551, with regard to every point touched upon in this

7, with the edition of 1587, while Nos. 1-4 stand all alone and represent a new departure. No. 5 therefore is the original print, and Gamba⁶ should not have said that in the case of No. 5 the 'Figure' were all transferred to the end but that they had been allowed to remain there.

The conclusion which has just been reached is confirmed by other evidence. All of the five prints, *e. g.*, bear on the title-page of the *Asino d'Oro*, etc., the statement: '*la contenenza delle quali (i. e. operette) haurai nella seguente carta.*' As a matter of fact, however, only No. 5 has the contents on the next leaf; Nos. 1-4 print them on the following page. Or take a few examples from the *Principe*. No. 5 retains *Golpe* wherever it occurs (chapter XVIII); Nos. 1-3 (No. 4 was not examined in the case of the *Principe*) substitute *Volpe* for it. No. 5 invariably preserves *contenendo* (*contennendi*), once in chapter XIV, three times in XVI, five times in XIX, once in XXIII; Nos. 1-3 replace it by *disprezzare*, *vile*, *abietto* or *disprezzato*. No. 5 prints in XII correctly: *giudicorno non potere più vincere con lui, perche non voleua, ne poteano licentiarlo*; Nos. 1-3 put *voleuano* in the place of *voleua*, an error which according to Lisio is still marring some of the most recent editions. Examples from the *Principe* and the other writings might be multiplied, but I trust that this evidence will be regarded as sufficient to establish the conclusion that Gamba No. 5 is the original print and that at the same time the complete agreement of Nos. 1-4 (3) in all of these points has made it all but certain that only one of them can be directly derived from No. 5 and that the remaining three must be derived from that one directly or indirectly instead of resting immediately upon No. 5.

The discovery of the print which is directly based upon No. 5 is simplified by the fact that the four remaining ones form two groups, inasmuch as No. 1 agrees with No. 2 page by page and mostly even line by line, and No. 3 corresponds to No. 4 to almost the same extent. At

the same time it can easily be shown that No. 4 is a poor reprint of No. 3, and that No. 1 is a somewhat independent reproduction of No. 2, so that the problem is narrowed down to the question as to whether it is No. 2 or No. 3 that directly derives from No. 5. I shall first corroborate the evidence which tended to show that Nos. 1-4 are so closely connected among each other that only one of them can be based on No. 5, then dispose of the relations of No. 4 to No. 3 and No. 1 to No. 2, and finally prove that only No. 2 goes directly back to No. 5.

The close connection which we have seen to exist between Nos. 1-4 is confirmed by the following common deviations in the *Novella*. First, all four omit *per lui* in *fù deliberato per lui*, *ne in esserne stato cagione la moglie*, *tutti i in capace di tutti i tuoi Baroni* and once more *ne in se ne ritornò* at the close. Second, all change in the argument *mogliere* to *moglie* and in the text proper *per l'adrieto* to *per l'adietro* and *tutti quelli disagi* to *tutti gli disagi*. Third, all correct the double *r* in *à gli orrecchi*. Fourth, all make the mistakes of printing *quante ricchezze*, *sopra tutte*, *farai*, *arrichito* and *in capello* in place of *q. ricchezze*, *s. tutto*, *farei*, *arricchito* and *in cappello*. If these things are added to the evidence furnished above from the *Arte*, the title-page of the *Asino d'Oro* and the *Principe*, it must be granted that only one of the four can directly rest upon No. 5.

The dependence of No. 4 upon No. 3 is so self-evident that I have compared of No. 4 only the general explanatory remarks on the 'Figure' and the *Novella*. In the former No. 4 adds to two misprints of No. 3 *possitate* in place of *possiate*; in the latter there is quite a list of additional errors without the compensation of a single correction. *ianta*, *veleua*, *grando* for *tanta*, *voleua*, *grado*; the omissions of *lo* before *costringeua* and of *se* before *giouerà*; *e' ei sono*, *solemne*, *pericolo*, *che'il* in place of *e' ci sono*, *solenne*, *pericoli*, *che'l*; finally the unnecessary substitutions of *buon partito* and *la quale fù* for *buono partito* and *la qual fù*. None of these errors and substitutions recur in No. 3 or in any of the other prints of the Testina, but *pericolo*, *buon partito*, *la quale fu* and the omission of *lo* are found in the edition of Genova of 1798 which had the misfortune of using No. 4 for

article. The others were not accessible to me lately, but from former consultations I feel sure they do not differ from the edition of 1529 in the matters at issue.

⁶L. c., p. 195—*le sette figure appartenenti all'Arte della Guerra, in vece di essere inserite a' luoghi loro, furono tutte trasportate al fine della medesima . . .*

its basis in the *Novella*, and the first three expressions also in the most sumptuous of all editions of Machiavelli, that of Milan of 1810-1811 in eleven large quarto volumes, which in its turn rests on that of Geneva of 1798. No. 4 therefore cannot have been the basis of No. 3, but must be a reprint of it, probably made by a publisher and compositors not familiar with the Italian language.

The dependence of No. 1 upon No. 2 is revealed by the following examples from the *Novella* and the *Principe*. In the *Novella* No. 1 alone contains the misprints *honorissimamente*, *nondimento*, and once *honestà* for *honoratissimamente*, *nondimeno* and *Honestà*. Only No. 1 changes *usuraria*, *in casa Roderigo*, *à casa Gio. Matteo*, *nimici*, *benefitio* and *sapiendo* to *usuraria*, *in casa di R.*, *à casa di G. M.*, *nemici*, *beneficio* and *sapendo*. No. 1 alone corrects *trarnarlo* and *sieno* into *trarnelo* and *sieno*. While no special weight shall be attached to *honorissimamente* and *honestà*, *nondimento* and some of the alterations actually do recur in later editions, e. g. those of London of 1747 and 1772 and surely would have crept into other prints of the Testina if any of them had used No. 1 for its basis.

The *Principe* manifests the same solitary and independent position of No. 1. Nos. 5, 2 and 3 (No. 4 was not compared) offer *doi modi* (IV), *giouorono* (VII), *strasordinaria* (VII), *tuorre* (IX) where No. 1 has the more modern forms *due modi*, *giouarono*, *straordinaria*, *torre*. Nos. 5, 2 and 3 have in common the misprints, *honoramente* (VIII), *rifugirse* (X), *la natu* (!) *de' fiumi* (XIV), *guadarsi* (XV) where No. 1 reads correctly *honoratamente*, *rifugirsi*, *la natura de' fiumi*, *guardarsi*. On the other hand Nos. 5, 2 and 3 print correctly: *tirarsi dietro i popoli* (IV), *tutti quelli che de gli ordini nuovi farebbono bene* (VI), *vi si fondi* (IX), *à loro pare esser equali à lui* (IX), *durare poca fatica* (XII) where No. 1 has *trarsi dietro i p.*, *tutti quelli che gli ordini, etc.*, *vi si fonda, à loro per esser, etc.*, *dare p. f.* Since No. 1, therefore, can not possibly have been the source of No. 2, but on the contrary derives from it, just as No. 4 from No. 3, it remains only to determine whether No. 2 or No. 3 directly depends on No. 5. Here evidence is more scarce, but it appears nevertheless on close examination.

The first clue that No. 2 and not No. 3 is based

on No. 5 was furnished to me by a misplaced comma in the *Novella*. Only Nos. 5 and 2 punctuate *Fratel, mio io ho teo*; No. 3 does not punctuate here at all. For the rest the *Novella* yields no evidence unless it be the wrong punctuation *che alcuna donna, fusse spiritata* in No. 3 which is repeated e. g. in the editions of 1679 and 1680 and 1726 but not in No. 2. In the explanations of the Figure, No. 2 has no error; No. 3 prints *mostravi* and *à caratteri* in place of *mostrarvi* and *di caratteri*, mistakes repeated again in the edition of 1726. In the heading over the text of the *Principe* No. 2 in accordance with No. 5 reads *Segretario*; No. 3 has changed this to the usual spelling *Secretario*. No. 2 gives the main title exactly like No. 5; No. 3 erroneously adds *Al Santissimo et Beatissimo Padre, Signore Nostro Clemente VII. Pont. Mass.* which properly belongs to the *Historie* only. No. 2 puts the general table of contents in its due place; No. 3 inserts it between the *Proemio* and the text of the *Historie*. No. 2 reproduces the privilege concerning the print and sale of the *Historie, Principe* and *Discorsi* granted by Clemens VII to Blado; No. 3 omits both. These points in favor of No. 2 are not many in number, but I trust they will be sufficient, all the more so, because in spite of some ornamental initials and the like, the whole make up of No. 3 is inferior to that of No. 2.

No. 5, therefore, is the original print and should be called A. No. 2 = B is based upon No. 5. It shows a certain independence in making, as we have seen, the more radical alterations that distinguish the four other prints from No. 5. Besides it is the only one that at least in a few cases in the *Principe*—I refer to most of the substitutions for *contennendo*, to which *parato à resistere alli suoi colpi* in place of *parato à resistela* (!) (close of XIV) may be added—consulted another edition besides No. 5. No. 1 = C makes some more changes but mostly only of an orthographical nature, modernizing antiquated forms; at the same time it corrects not a few typographical errors without however failing to commit some new ones of its own. No. 3 is upon the whole a faithful, almost a slavish reprint of No. 2; as a rule it does not even correct the most obvious misprints but is guilty of quite a number of new ones. The confusion which reigns from the main title to the

beginning of the text of the *Historie* may be partly due to the use of a copy of No. 2, the first leaves of which were mutilated or misplaced. No. 4 = E is an often faulty reproduction of No. 3, of which no good of any kind can be said and which should be carefully guarded against.

No. 5 seems gradually to have lost reputation. For while the original compilers of the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* had used it by the side of No. 1 and No. 3, in the fifth edition of 1863 only the latter two are specially cited. Jacques Charles Brunet in his *Manuel du Libraire*, etc., of 1862, Tome III, p. 1275, goes so far as to class it among the prints of the Testina that have 'très-peu de valeur.' This investigation, I trust, has shown on the contrary that No. 5 is the only one among the five that can have any sort of value for the constitution of the text¹ and above all the only one by the aid of which the relation of the Testina to previous prints can be studied. No. 1 perhaps contains fewer ordinary misprints than any other, but it shows at the same time the most numerous intentional modernisations and deviations from No. 5 and therefore is by no means qualified to stand as the representative of the Testina in any question of text criticism. It has both the excellencies and the shortcomings of an old picture that at one time was touched up to suit the taste of a younger owner.

(To be continued).

A. GERBER.

Wiesbaden.

BEOWULF 30, 53, 132, 2957. I.

penden wordum wēold wine Scyldinga,
lēof land-fruma, lange āhte. 30 f.

In a most kind and helpful review of my translation of *Beowulf*—the justice of his corrections in the main I gratefully admit—Professor Klaeber

¹ The value of T 5 for a constitution of the text is limited by the fact that it rests solely on previous prints of very different merit and not on any manuscript authority. In cases, however, where the latter is scarce or wanting the sometimes very bright emendations of T 5 should not be left unheeded.

recently (*Anglia Beiblatt*, 16, 225) dissented from my rendering of these lines, with the comment that "whatever our interpretation of line 31 may be, *wordum wēold* is 'wielded his word' (W. Morris)." This certainly is one possible interpretation, providing the ms. reading is accepted. But should it be?

The ms. reading may well be preferred to a baker's dozen or more of the many emendations or interpretations which have been offered. Professor Kock (*Anglia*, 27, 221–223) has summarized a number of these: Thorpe and Grein, *āhte* used absolutely; Bugge, place line 31 after 32; Heyne-Socin supply *geweald*, as object of *āhte*, out of *wordum wēold*; Rieger, read *līfe* for *leof*; Kluge, *lændagas* or *land* for *lange*; Lübke, *land* for *leof*; Cosijn, *lange þrāge* (cf. 54) for *lange āhte*; Trautmann, *langre āhte*, the long possession; Sievers (*Beiträge*, 9, 136), *lacuna*. Kock himself proposes *lān geāhte* (cf. *lān* in *lānlade*, *Codex Dipl.*, ed. Kemble, 3, 165. 52, perhaps originally *læn* as in *lænland*, *læne līf*, *lændagas*; *geāhte*, not in Bosworth-Toller but recorded in *Ælfric's Homilies*, Sweet's *Reader*, p. 65, l. 122). *Lange* occurs at the end of the line in the ms., and Kock contends the *ge* should be read with *āhte* in the next line (cf. *mange| þēon*, same page, and *nege |feah*, second next page).

A suggestion of Professor Sievers, later than that summarized above, which he urges apparently with conviction (*Beiträge*, 29, 308), is that *wordum wēold* should be translated "der worter wol-tete," adding "d. h. nicht etwa 'der gebote waltete,' d. h. 'befahl, regierte' (so z. b. noch Heyne-Socin,⁶ 285), sondern wörtlich 'als er noch sprechen konnte,' d. h. kurz vor seinem tode (damit wäre denn auch zugleich die änderung von *lange āhte* in *lange þrāge* abgelehnt, an die ich selbst einmal Beitr. 9, 136 zweifelnd gedacht hätte; vgl. auch Cosijn, *Aant.* 1.) Die stelle erinnert dann an *meaht þū meðel-cwidum worda zewealdan?* Guthl., 989, 'kannst du noch sprechen,' von einem todkranken . . . und, wenn auch etwas entfernter an solche wie . . . *swā hē latē meahte elnes uncȳðiz areðe zewealdan* Guthl. 1199, und ähnlich *þeah hē late meahte . . . oreðe zebrēdan* ib. 1138."

Though some of these emendations are suggestive, none are satisfactory. Kock's is as im-